



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,423	02/14/2005	Mats Naslund	P17234-US1	6264
27045	7590	07/15/2009		
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			EXAMINER COPPOLA, JACOB C	
			ART UNIT 3621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/15/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/524,423

Applicant(s)

NASLUND ET AL.

Examiner

JACOB C. COPPOLA

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. This action is in reply to the 'Amendments to the Claims' and 'Remarks' filed on 30 March 2009 ("09 Mar Amendments" and "09 Mar Remarks," respectively).
2. Claims 46-67 are currently pending.
3. Claims 64-66 have been previously withdrawn.
4. The previous Restriction requirement (see Paper No. 20080731, ¶ 1-9) mailed August 6, 2008 is hereby withdrawn.
5. The previous Election of Species requirement (see Paper No. 20080731, ¶ 10-19) mailed August 6, 2008 is hereby withdrawn.
6. Because of Applicants' amendments to the claims, a new Restriction requirement and a new Election of Species requirement is set forth below.

Restrictions

7. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. §121:
 - I. Claims 46-53 and 67, drawn to a method of monitoring client-usage, classified in class 705, subclass 59;
 - II. Claims 54-63, drawn to a system capable of using digital content, classified in class 705, subclass 52; and
 - III. Claims 64-66, drawn to digital rights management system, classified in class 705, subclass 67.

8. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus (and by hand), namely an apparatus that does not comprise a receiving agent.

9. Inventions I and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, the subcombination of Invention III has separate utility such as data authentication. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

10. Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, the subcombination of Invention III has separate utility such as data authentication. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

11. The Examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where Applicants elect a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicants are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the

present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

12. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. §101 and/or 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

13. Applicants are advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 C.F.R. §1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

14. **Because Applicants have received a first action on the merits for the previous Invention I (now separated into patentably distinct Inventions I and II, the distinction caused by Applicants' 09 Mar Amendments), Applicants are required to elect either**

Invention I or Invention II (along with electing a corresponding species, as described below). See MPEP §819.

15. The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.144.

16. If claims are added after the election, Applicants must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention (and the elected species, see below).

17. Should Applicants traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, Applicants should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the Examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of the other invention.

Election of Species

18. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

- Species A: Represented by Figure 2;
- Species B: Represented by Figure 4;
- Species C: Represented by Figure 7; and
- Species D: Represented by Figure 9.

19. The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

20. In addition to selecting an invention (*i.e.*, Invention I or II), Applicants are also required under 35 U.S.C. §121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is considered generic.

21. There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (*e.g.*, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. §101 and/or 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

22. Applicants are advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 C.F.R. §1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

23. The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be

considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.144.

24. **If claims are added after the election, Applicants must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.**

25. Should Applicants traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, Applicants should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the Examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

26. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, Applicants will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. §1.141.

Conclusion

27. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Jacob C. Coppola whose telephone number is 571.270.3922. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached at 571.272.6779.

28. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866.217.9197 (toll-free).

/JACOB C. COPPOLA/
Examiner, Art Unit 3621
July 7, 2009

/ANDREW J. FISCHER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3621